

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is prepared in response to the Office action mailed on 13 October 2006 (Paper No. 09242005).

By this Amendment, claims 29, 30, and 33 have been amended. Thus, claims 29-35 remain pending in the application.

Claims 29-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Fujikawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,414,738) in view of Ohori (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0052954) for the reasons stated in section 2 bridging pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action.

By this Amendment, the claims have been revised to correct minor informalities and it is submitted that claims 29-35 are patentable over Fujikawa in view of Ohori for the following reasons:

The Examiner has admitted that Fujikawa fails to disclose the required titanium layer on top of the titanium nitride layer. That is, as illustrated in Fig. 5 of Fujikawa, the drain 9 is covered by a titanium nitride layer 15 which is then covered by a transparent ITO display electrode 12.

The Examiner then argues that Ohori discloses a liquid crystal display device having

a titanium layer located on top between the source electrode and transparent display electrode and further argues that it would be obvious to include the required titanium layer as the top layer between the source electrode and the transparent display electrode in Fujikawa as taught by Ohori.

Applicants strongly disagree with the Examiner's assertions. Namely, Ohori discusses interfacing the drain electrode and the ITO electrode with a titanium layer directly in contact with both electrodes to improve the electrical connection between the electrodes.

Thus, the Examiner has ignored the fact that Ohori fails to teach or suggest a titanium nitride layer between the drain electrode and the ITO electrode as taught by Fujikawa. That is, both Fujikawa and Ohori teach away from connecting the drain electrode and the ITO electrode with **both a titanium nitride layer and a titanium layer** as recited in the present claims. Rather, each teaches connecting the drain electrode and the ITO electrode with **only a single layer** therebetween.

Accordingly, it is submitted that it would not be obvious to combine Fujikawa and Ohori in the fashion noted by the Examiner.

Furthermore, with regard to claims 31 and 33, column 8 of Fujikawa does not teach or suggest the recited thicknesses but rather teaches that the titanium nitride layers are both

within a range of 500-1000 Å.

With regard to claims 35, lines 15-40 of Fujikawa do not teach or suggest an aluminum silicon alloy and therefore do not teach an aluminum silicon alloy containing about 2 wt% of silicon as recited in this claim.

In view of the above, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P57001  
Date: 1/16/07  
I.D.: REB/HMZ